



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/973,046	10/10/2001	Soon-ho Jung	Q65216	5067
7590 04/14/2005			EXAMINER	
SUGHRUE, MION, ZINN,			TIEU, BINH KIEN	
MACPEAK & SEAS, PLLC Suite 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. Washington, DC 20037-3213			2643	
			DATE MAILED: 04/14/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		09/973,046	JUNG, SOON-HO			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	<u> </u>	BINH K. TIEU	2643			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication a or Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period reto reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely period to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statutely precived by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I.  1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24	November 2004.	•			
•	•	is action is non-final.				
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Dispositi	on of Claims					
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdred Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	awn from consideration.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examir	ner.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the I	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents.  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bure see the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicationity documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachmen	t(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)						
3) Inform	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 r No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Da  8) 5) Notice of Informal P  6) Other:	ate Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Art Unit: 2643

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see Applicant's remarks, filed 11/24/2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-11 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) and (e) being anticipated by Sprague et al. (US 5,247,575), Takase et al. (US 6,381,513), Inselberg (US 6,760,595) and under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) in combination of Sprague in view of Ishizaki et al. (US 5,884,140) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Chen (US 5,978,775), Treyz et al. (US 6,587,835) and Sprague et al. (US 5,247,575).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.
- 3. Claims 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by of Treyz et al. (U.S. Pat. #: 6,587,835).

Regarding claim 10, Treyz teaches a Bluetooth server, comprising:

Art Unit: 2643

a Bluetooth data transception processing portion for wirelessly transmitting data to a terminal and receiving data from the terminal (i.e., wireless transmitter/receiver 182 shown in figure 13 is used to interact with Handheld computer device 12; col.20, lines 57-67);

a database for storing the data to be transmitted to the terminal, the data being classified into a plurality of items (i.e., shopping list stored in the each of stores' computers 184; col.21, lines 11-14);

a program transmitting portion for transmitting to the terminal through the Bluetooth data transception processing portion an item selecting program through which the user selects at least one item among the plurality of items (col.29, line 66 - col.30, line 7); and

data transmitting portion for transmitting data of the database corresponding to the item selected by the user to the terminal through the Bluetooth data processing portion, when receiving from the terminal the item selected by the user through the item selecting program (col.30, lines 23-50).

Regarding claim 11, Treyz teaches a Bluetooth terminal (i.e., Handheld computing device 12), comprising:

a Bluetooth data transception processing portion for wirelessly transmitting a data to a server and receiving a data from the server (see transceiving portion 88 of device 12 in figure 4; col.15, lines 16-35);

a program executing portion for receiving an item selecting program from the server through the Bluetooth data transception processing portion and executing the item selecting program, through which the user selects an item among a plurality of items (col.24, lines 40-54 and col.24, line 64 – col.25, line 4; col.30, lines 30-67 and col.31, lines 20-47);

Art Unit: 2643

a command transmitting portion (i.e., user input interface 134 in figure 6; col.16, lines 37-41) for transmitting to the server data (i.e., data representing option 328, 330, etc.) corresponding to the item (i.e., brochure, information on warranties, etc.) selected by the user through the item selecting program (col.30, lines 30-67); and

display means for displaying to the user the data received from the server, the data corresponding to the item selected by the user through the Bluetooth data transception processing portion (col.31, lines 20-47; also read col.32, lines 37-59).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprague et al. (U.S. Pat. #: 5,247,575 as cited in the previous Office Action) in view of Chen (U.S. Pat. #: 5,978,775).

Regarding claim 1, Sprague et al. ("Sprague") teaches a control method for controlling mutual wireless data transmission and reception between a terminal and a server (i.e., between base station 10 or newsbox 30 and one of PC computer, fax machine, etc. as shown in figure 1) that is embedded with a Bluetooth function, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2643

a) preparing a database which stores data to be transmitted from the server to the terminal, the data being classified into a plurality of items (i.e., data collections classified as new reports, stock market quotations, sports scores, etc. are stored in a database of base station and in local FM or TV stations 20, col.9, lines 14-43);

- c) receiving from the terminal a user's input item that is selected by the user (col.20, line 66 col.21, line 3); and
- d) transmitting to the terminal data corresponding to the user's input item (col.21, lines 16-24).

It should be noticed that Sprague fails to clearly teach the features of transmitting to the terminal an item selecting program, through which a user selects at least one of the items that the user wishes to receive from the server and receiving the user response input item through such item selecting program. However, Chen teaches such features in col.5, lines 4-40 for a purpose of eliminating retrieval of unavailable item(s) stored from a remote database.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of transmitting to the terminal an item selecting program, through which a user selects at least one of the items that the user wishes to receive from the server and receiving the user response input item through such item selecting program, as taught by Chen, into view of Sprague in order to eliminating retrieval of unavailable item(s) stored from any one of the remote local FM or TV stations' databases.

Regarding claim 2, Sprague further teaches limitations of the claim in col.17, line 57 – col.18, line 11.

Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claim 3, Sprague further teaches limitations of the claim in col.20, lines 48-65.

6. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sprague et al. (U.S. Pat. #: 5,247,575) in view of Chen (U.S. Pat. #: 5,978,775) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Boesjes (U.S. Pat. #: 6,799,165).

Regarding claim 4, Sprague and Chen, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the data stored at the database is voice data. However, Boesjes teaches such features in col. 5, lines 40-51.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the data stored at the database is voice data, as taught by Boesjes, into view of Sprague and Chen in order to provide dynamic retrieval music data service to wireless subscribers.

7. Claims 5-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Pat. #: 5,978,775) in view of Treyz et al. (U.S. Pat. #: 6,587,835).

Regarding claim 5, Chen teaches a control method for controlling data transmission and reception of a terminal that is embedded with a function for mutual wireline data transmission and reception with a server, comprising the steps of:

i) receiving an item selecting program (i.e., information menu 200) from the server (i.e., central catalog system of information distribution system; col.3, lines 39-56), the item selecting program providing an item selecting menu through which a user (i.e., terminal 5

Art Unit: 2643

shown in figure 1) can select at least one item in a database, the database storing data of a plurality of classified items (col.5, lines 4-12);

- ii) displaying the item selecting menu by executing the item selecting program (col.5, lines 13-32 and lines 48-53 and col.7, lines 40-49);
- iii) transmitting to the server data about a user's selection (i.e., customer's menu selection) that is made through the item selecting program (col.7, line 66 col.8, line 3);
- iv) receiving from the server data corresponding to the item selected by the user (col.8, lines 39-42); and
- v) displaying the data corresponding to the item selected by the user (col.8, lines 59-65).

It should be noticed that Chen teaches the control method performed at customer terminal 5 for the mutual wireline data transmissions. Chen fails to clearly teach the control method is performed by terminal 5 with Bluetooth or short range communications function in a wireless environment. However, Treyz et al. ("Treyz") teaches such feature in col.13, lines 22-38 for a purpose of communicating a computing device with a local server in a retail store in a mall.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the features of providing a terminal that is embedded with a Bluetooth function for mutual wireless data transmission and reception with a server, as taught by Treyz, into view of Chen in order to provide dynamic content delivery service to wireless subscribers.

Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claim 6, Treyz further teaches limitations of the claim in col.12, line 56 – co.13, line 15.

8. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Pat. #: 5,978,775) in view of Treyz et al. (U.S. Pat. #: 6,587,835) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Boesjes (U.S. Pat. #: 6,799,165).

Regarding claim 7, Chen and Treyz, in combination, teaches all subject matters as claimed above, except for the data stored at the database is voice data. However, Boesjes teaches such features in col. 5, lines 40-51.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of the data stored at the database is voice data, as taught by Boesjes, into view of Chen and Treyz in order to provide dynamic retrieval music data service to wireless subscribers.

9. Claims 8-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chen (U.S. Pat. #: 5,978,775) in view of Boesjes (U.S. Pat. #: 6,799,165).

Regarding claim 8, Chen teaches a system, as shown in figure 1, for wireless data transmission and reception, comprising:

a database for storing data to be provided to a user, the data classified into a plurality of items (i.e., memory of 46 of each of information supplier 1 through 3; col.3, lines 34-38 and col.6, lines 14-36);

a server (i.e., central catalog system 60) for transmitting both of an item selecting program that provides an item selecting menu through which the user selects at least one of the

Page 9

items, and a data corresponding to the item selected by the user (see figure 2A, note col.5, lines 4-40); and

a terminal (i.e. customer terminal 5) for executing the item selecting program that is received from the server so that the item selecting menu is displayed to the user, transmitting to the server data about the item that is selected through the item selecting menu and input by the user, and receiving and displaying data corresponding to the item selected by the user which is transmitted from the server (col.8, lines 28-42 and lines 59-65).

It should be noticed that Chen teaches the data transmissions between the server (central catalog system 60) and the customer terminal 5 via the communication network 100 and associated telephone line 95 (col.3, lines 53-56). Chen fails to teach wireless transmissions. However, Boesjes teaches such features in col.6, lines 20-34 for a purpose of offering sales of products to shoppers or buyers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the use of wireless communication transmissions such as satellite link or wireless link, as taught by Boesjes, into view of Chen in order to provide transmissions of information data from a remote storage server to the users.

Regarding claim 9, Boesjes further teaches limitations of the claim in col.5, lines 40-51.

Art Unit: 2643

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Binh K. Tieu whose telephone number is (571) 272-7510 and E-mail address: BINH.TIEU@USPTO.GOV.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Curtis Kuntz, can be reached on (571) 272-7499 and IF PAPER HAS BEEN MISSED FROM THIS OFFICIAL ACTION PACKAGE, PLEASE CALL Customer Service at (703) 306-0377 FOR THE SUBSTITUTIONS OR COPIES.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

Or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314

In formation regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (FAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the FAIR system, see <a href="http://pair-direct.uspto.gov">http://pair-direct.uspto.gov</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BINH TIEU PRIMARY EXAMINER

Art Unit 2643

Date: April 08, 2005